

So the demand for the previous question was not sustained.

The question then recurring upon concurring in the motion submitted by Mr. Groome,

Mr. Groome demanded the yeas and nays,

The demand being sustained.

The yeas and nays were called, and appeared as follows :

AFFIRMATIVE.

Messrs.

Gorman, Speaker,	Ford, of Q. A.,	Harig,
Colton, of St. M.'s,	Phillips,	McColgan,
Stone,	Rowe,	Ardinger,
Foard, of B. co.,	Delaplane,	Newcomer,
Roach,	Miller,	Whitson,
Dougherty,	Routzahn,	Porter,
Vickers,	McCosker,	Coles,
Groome,	Stewart,	Young, of Alle.,
Penington,	Clark, of B. city,	Robinette—29.
Sasscer,	Colton, of B. city,	

NEGATIVE.

Messrs.

Wilmer,	Radcliffe,	Travers,
Hurt.	Mearns,	Kirk,
Wells,	Scott,	Chaisty,
Duvall,	Bowie,	Feig,
Henkle,	Eareckson,	Markland,
Bond,	Franklin,	Griswold,
Sparrow,	Parker,	Hilton,
Chapman,	Riley,	Riggs,
Shipley,	Baldwin,	Clark, of Mont.,
Turner,	Deweese,	Lamotte, L. A. J.,
Litzenger,	Hamilton, T. H.,	Polk,
Spencer,	Hamilton, C. R.,	Lamotte, H. H.,
Butler,	Jamart,	Johnson,
Goldsborough,	Foster,	Langrell—44.
Smith,	Staylor,	

So the motion submitted by Mr. Groome to recommit the bill did not prevail.

The question then recurring upon the reading of sub-section 3, section 89,

Mr. Kirk moved the previous question,

The question then being,

"Shall the previous question be now put?"

Mr. Miller demanded the yeas and nays,